REMARKS

Claims 1-28, 31 and 32 are all the claims pending in the application. This Response, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated June 30, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-28, 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chang et al. (US 2002/0026443; henceforth "Chang") in view of Chou et al. (US 6,370,541; henceforth "Chou"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In the Response filed February 27, 2008, Applicant argued that neither Chang nor Chou, individually, or in combination teach "creating the persistent federated folder" which "has the ability to save a federated search result" as recited in claim 1. In response, the Examiner asserts that Chang (with reference to Figs. 1 and 6 and paragraphs [0067]) describes returning query results in the form of a collection of objects containing Dynamic Data Objects (DDOs). Further, the Examiner asserts that that Chang teaches (with reference to paragraphs [0077] and [0080]) each element in the resulting collection can be a document or a folder containing other folders and documents. Based on these teachings, the Examiner asserts that Chang describes the creation of folders comprising a federated collection of query results which have the ability to save a federated search result. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has misconstrued Chang.

Chang is directed to federated searches of heterogeneous datastores. Although paragraph [0067] describes returning a federated collection of the results of each query's components, this section provides no teach regarding creating a federated folder to store the collection of results. In other words, Chang may teach returning a collection of objects representing the results of a federated search, but this section does not teach creating a federated folder storing this collection of objects. Further, paragraph [0077] states that the collection of objects contains Dynamic Data Objects (DDO) which have attributes, and further teaches that the value of these attributes can be references to other DDOs or collections of DDOs. This paragraph also states that this structure "is quite general and flexible enough to represent folder and document data models". However, this does not teach that the query creates a federated folder, but only that query can contain folders and other objects which refer to other objects relevant to the search. This is confirmed in paragraph [0080] which states that any element in the resulting collection "can be a combination of documents, documents with parts, folders, or folders containing other folders". In other words, the collection of query results may contain references to other query results, such as folders retrieved from the queried database and containing documents which were also retrieved from the queried database. These sections only teach returning a collection of objects based on the query and do not teach "creating the persistent federated folder on a local federated datastore …wherein the persistent federated folder has the ability to save a federated search result…" as claimed.

The Examiner also asserts that Chang (with reference to paragraph [0165]) describes persistent object identifiers that identify the location of the persistent data of the data object in

the data store. Further, the Examiner asserts that this disclosure reasonably supports that objects such as the DDOs have persistent identifiers. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has misconstrued this section as well.

Although paragraph [0165] may describe the data objects having persistent identification that identifies the location were the persistent data of the data object is stored, this paragraph does not provide any teachings related to storing the collection of objects retrieved by the query. In other words, each object retrieved from the query has an identifier which identifies where the persistent data (i.e. the original document or folder) of the data object is stored (i.e. where the object was retrieved from). Further, paragraph [0165] also describes that if a persistent ID is not set, it can be automatically created when an object is retrieved from a database. In other words, when an object is first retrieved, it is given an identifier that can be used later when the object is retrieved by a subsequent query. Again, Applicant submits that this section, even in combination with the sections discussed above does not teach "creating the persistent federated folder on a local federated datastore …wherein the persistent federated folder has the ability to save a federated search result…" as claimed.

The Examiner also asserts that Chou (with reference to Col. 106, lines 31-33) describes a federated collection created to hold the results of a query. Further, the Examiner asserts that Chou (with reference to Col. 113, lines 31-33) describes an object DKfolder being a subclass to hold a collection of documents and folders. Further, the Examiner asserts that Chou (with reference to Col. 114, lines 14-15) describes making a DDO persistent in a folder. Again, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has misconstrued the applied reference.

Chou is directed to a design and implementation of a client/server framework for federated multi-search and update across heterogeneous datastores. Column 106, lines 31-53 describes a collection of result objects (DKResults objects) that holds the results of each subquery which is performed as part of the larger query of several heterogeneous datastores. This section only describes the objects being collected and held by the federated collection as the results are returned, so that the user can review the collective results of the entire query process. This section provides no teachings of "creating the persistent federated folder on a local federated datastore …wherein the persistent federated folder has the ability to save a federated search result…" as claimed.

Further, Columns 113 and 114 describe features of a subclass of object known as the DKfolder. This object allows for sequential collection of document and folder DDOs, which keeps track of addition and deletion of objects to the DKfolder to be reflected when the DDOs are returned to the back-end datastore. In other words, this object allows objects to be added and deleted from the back end datastore by being added or deleted from the DKfolder object. This is described in detail on lines 14-22 of Col. 114. This section describes that when a new member is added to the DKFolder, this is immediately reflected in the backend data store, making the addition to the data store persistent. In other words the new member will be shown in the DKfolder collection as well as stored in the persistent folder representation in the back end database. The DKfolder is not described as being a persistent folder, but is instead shown as an object which can be used to update persistent folder representations in the original datastores from which a federated data store retrieves information. Further, these sections provide no

teachings related to the query or search results, but are directed to updating when documents are added or deleted from the back end datastore. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Chou, alone, or in combination with Chang discussed above, do not teach "creating the persistent federated folder on a local federated datastore within the federated content management system...wherein the persistent federated folder has the ability to save a federated search result..." as claimed.

For at least the above discussed reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and all claims dependant thereon are patentable over the applied references. Further, to the extent that claims 17 and 24 recite features similar to those discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims and all claims dependant thereon are patentable for reasons analogous to those discussed above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880 via EFS payment screen. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860
WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133
46159
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 8, 2008